

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1-4, 15-18, and 28-33 are pending in the above-identified patent application. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 15.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the August 30, 2004 telephonic interview with Alexander Shvarts (Reg. No. 47,943) and the undersigned attorney. During the interview, independent claims 1 and 15 were discussed. Applicants asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time Robinson U.S. Patent No. 5,068,823 (hereinafter "Robinson") was filed, would not consider the external memory disclosed in Robinson to be a secondary storage device. The Examiner provided applicants with a definition for external memory that included magnetic disks. However, the Examiner admitted that the earliest source he could find having this definition was dated 1997, which is well after the filing date of Robinson (i.e., 1988).

Application No. 10/666,948
Amendment Dated November 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 3, 2004

In order to advance the prosecution of this case, applicants agreed to amend the claims to more particularly define the secondary storage device.

Claims 1-4 and 15-18

Claims 1-4 and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Robinson. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 15 to more particularly define the secondary storage device to be a mass storage device. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported and justified by the specification.

In light of the telephonic interview and the applicants' amendments to claims 1 and 15, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 15 are allowable. Claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, and claims 16-18, which depend from claim 15, are also allowable.

Claims 28-33

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lacey U.S. Patent No. 5,822,570 (hereinafter "Lacey"). Claims 29-33 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim 28. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention, as defined by independent claim 28, relates to managing resources in a reconfigurable computer that contains programmable logic resources. A virtual computer operating system is used during run-time to determine whether to use a hardware implementation or a software implementation for a given function of a given application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lacey does not show or suggest a "method for managing resources in a computer that contains programmable logic resources that are reconfigurable to optimize the ability of the computer to handle a given application having multiple functions" as recited in claim 28 (emphasis added). Instead, Lacey describes dividing execution of an instruction stream among tightly coupled instruction execution units (e.g., a hardware instruction execution unit and an emulation instruction execution unit). (Lacey, col. 1, lines 10-17). In Lacey, dedicated instruction execution units are used to execute different types of instructions. This does not involve reconfigurable programmable logic resources as recited in applicants' claim 28.

For at least the foregoing reason, claim 28 and claims 29-33 that depend therefrom are allowable.

Application No. 10/666,948
Amendment Dated November 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 3, 2004

The Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings filed on September 19, 2003. Applicants respectfully submit that a Petition Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.182 For Entry of Drawings For Publication, along with eight (8) sheets of formal drawings, were filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 14, 2004. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak
Evelyn C. Mak
Registration No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE LLP
Customer No. 36981
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000